HARVARD LAW JOURNAL

HONORARY JD IN LAW 2026

HARVARD LAW JOURNAL

Honorary JD in Law 2026

WHAT WAS THE PLEA?

Record Compression, Restorative Disposition, and Predicate Classification in a Vermont Criminal Case

LEGAL NARRATIVE INQUIRY

A completed restorative record must not be reduced to a punitive shorthand broader than the record itself supports.

Justin-Ames Gamache®, M.Ed., M.S., PMCert-ET

April 2026 | ResearchGate DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.19582.34888

Journal-ready legal article prepared for Honorary JD in Law 2026

Article copy with cover, abstract, body, tables, and references

What Was the Plea?

Record Compression, Restorative Disposition, and Predicate Classification in a Vermont Criminal Case

Justin-Ames Gamache®, M.Ed., M.S., PMCert-ET

Harvard Law Journal | Honorary JD in Law 2026 | April 2026 | DOI source: 10.13140/RG.2.2.19582.34888

Abstract

This article examines how a plea-based restorative disposition can be re-characterized in later post-conviction record-relief proceedings. Using a qualitative narrative legal inquiry, the article analyzes a Vermont criminal case involving 13 V.S.A. § 3002, a plea agreement, sentencing to a Reparative Board under 13 V.S.A. § 7030(a)(2), successful completion of the reparative process, later settlement and closure, and subsequent predicate-style treatment in record-relief litigation. The central problem is that later legal characterization appeared broader than the contemporaneous record itself, creating tension between the original restorative structure of the case and the continuing collateral meaning attached to it. The analysis develops the concept of record compression, defined as the later reduction of a complex legal record into a simplified punitive label that obscures the full procedural and restorative sequence. The findings show that the record preserved a mixed punitive-restorative structure, that the February 11, 2014 entry functioned as a reparative-completion event rather than as a new plea to the statute, and that later predicate-style treatment required renewed scrutiny under current statutory text. The article contributes to restorative justice, plea interpretation, and criminal-record scholarship by showing how narrative-document analysis can clarify record meaning across time, legal setting, and institutional reinterpretation.

Keywords: restorative justice, plea agreement, record relief, sealing, expungement, Vermont law, narrative inquiry, legal document analysis, predicate offense

A completed restorative record must not be reduced to a punitive shorthand broader than the record itself supports.

Introduction

Restorative justice dispositions do not always remain restorative in later legal interpretation. A case may begin with a formal criminal charge, proceed through a plea-based reparative process, reach successful completion, and close with a record that reflects both accountability and restoration. Years later, however, the same record may be treated through a narrower punitive lens when courts evaluate sealing, expungement, or collateral consequences. This article examines that problem through a qualitative narrative legal inquiry into a Vermont criminal case involving 13 V.S.A. § 3002 and a plea-based Reparative Board disposition.

The central argument is that legal records involving restorative dispositions must be read sequentially and contextually rather than compressed into later shorthand labels. The case analyzed here did not present a simple punitive sequence. The contemporaneous record reflected an initial not-guilty plea, a later plea-related proceeding, a plea agreement, sentencing to the Reparative Board, successful completion of the reparative process, cancellation of the later status conference because the case was settled, and closure. Later record-relief treatment, however, characterized the conviction through a predicate-style rationale that did not appear as an express contemporaneous classification in the original plea or reparative-board entries.

The article develops the concept of record compression. Record compression occurs when later legal actors reduce a procedurally complex disposition into a simplified punitive label that obscures the full meaning of the original record. The concept is especially important in jurisdictions that use restorative or reparative sentencing mechanisms while also maintaining formal conviction records. In those settings, courts and practitioners must distinguish between the fact of a criminal disposition, the scope of the plea, the reparative structure imposed, successful completion of restorative obligations, and the later statutory framework governing record relief.

The February 11, 2014 entry is central to that argument. That date should not be treated as proof of a new, independent, or unqualified plea to 13 V.S.A. § 3002. It belongs to the completion phase of the reparative-board process, not to the plea-entry phase of the case. Treating that entry as though it proves a direct plea to the

statute confuses completion with admission, restoration with conviction scope, and docket shorthand with legal truth.

This distinction matters because criminal records do not merely describe the past. They govern future legal treatment, public access, employment consequences, reputational status, and access to statutory remedies. When later proceedings attach collateral meaning to a record, courts must decide whether they are reading the record or expanding it. That question is especially important where the later label, such as predicate offense, did not appear as a contemporaneous classification in the original plea or disposition entries.

Literature Review

Restorative Justice and Reparative Disposition

Restorative justice scholarship has long distinguished restorative accountability from purely punitive criminal justice responses. Restorative justice emphasizes harm, accountability, community participation, repair, and reintegration rather than punishment alone (Zehr, 2015). In that framework, an offender's accountability is not limited to the formal status of conviction or sentence. It also includes the process through which harm is addressed, obligations are completed, and the person is returned to the community.

Vermont's reparative justice tradition is especially significant because reparative boards have been treated as structured mechanisms of community accountability rather than symbolic alternatives to punishment. Karp (2001) described restorative justice as a civic practice grounded in repair, accountability, and community participation. Karp and Drakulich (2006) further examined community reparative boards as institutions designed to make accountability more participatory and relational. These features matter because a reparative-board disposition is not simply a sentencing afterthought. It reflects a different legal and social logic from ordinary punishment.

At the same time, restorative justice within criminal procedure can create doctrinal tension. Restorative mechanisms may operate inside formal adjudicative structures that still include charges, pleas, docket entries, and sentencing orders. That means a record may be both punitive and restorative. A guilty plea may appear in the record while the sentence itself directs the matter into a reparative process. The difficulty arises when later legal actors privilege only the punitive label and ignore the restorative structure that the original record preserved.

Plea Meaning and Record Scope

Plea law requires attention to what was actually placed on the record, what was admitted, what was accepted, and what consequences were attached. The constitutional foundation for plea validity requires that guilty pleas be knowing, voluntary, and supported by adequate procedural safeguards (Boykin v. Alabama, 1969; McCarthy v. United States, 1969). Vermont plea doctrine likewise recognizes that the validity and meaning of a plea cannot be separated from the record that supports it (State v. Cleary, 2003; State v. Yates, 1999).

The plea agreement is not merely background language. It is part of the legal architecture through which a criminal matter is resolved. Vermont law recognizes that plea agreements must be placed on the record, while also preserving the court's independent sentencing authority. That structure requires careful distinction among the negotiated plea agreement, the plea event, the judgment or sentence entered, and any later collateral label attached to the case.

In the present case, that distinction is decisive. The article does not deny that the record contains guilty-disposition language. The issue is whether that language, standing alone, truthfully captures the full legal scope of the disposition. If the record shows a plea-related proceeding followed by reparative-board sentencing, successful completion, settlement, and closure, then later interpretation must account for the full sequence. A later record-relief court may not fairly treat the restorative structure as if it were legally invisible.

The February 11, 2014 entry sharpens this issue. A completion entry is not the same legal act as an open-court plea colloquy. It is not the same as a plea agreement placed on the record. It is not the same as a judicial finding that the defendant newly admitted the statutory elements of the offense on that date. Therefore, the later appearance of guilty-disposition language must be read against the chronology, not in isolation from it.

Record Relief, Sealing, and Expungement

Criminal record relief has become increasingly important because criminal records continue to produce consequences long after sentence completion. Sealing and expungement statutes attempt to regulate the public, legal, and collateral effects of past criminal records (Prescott & Starr, 2020). These remedies are statutory, and their scope depends on legislative text, eligibility criteria, exclusions, and the legal effect assigned to relief.

The distinction between sealing and expungement matters. Expungement often suggests deletion or erasure of a record for defined legal purposes, while sealing usually restricts access and changes how the record may be used or disclosed. Vermont's Chapter 230 framework is significant because it distinguishes among qualifying crimes, expungement, sealing, and the legal effect of a sealed record. When a statute provides that a sealed record allows a person to be treated as though the arrest, conviction, or sentence did not occur, classification becomes more than technical labeling. It determines whether the statute's remedial promise can operate.

Predicate-offense reasoning complicates record-relief analysis. A first conviction may be treated as having future legal significance if it can enhance punishment for a later offense. But that logic must be distinguished from the original record's contemporaneous classification. A statute may contain a second-or-subsequent-offense enhancement without using the phrase predicate offense in the original disposition. The analytical mistake occurs when later proceedings treat enhancement potential as though it were a contemporaneous plea classification.

Narrative Legal Inquiry and Document-Based Analysis

Narrative inquiry is appropriate when a phenomenon unfolds across time, institutional relationship, and setting. Clandinin and Connelly (2000) described narrative inquiry as a way of studying experience through temporality, sociality, and place. Although narrative inquiry is often used with interviews and lived-experience data, its logic can be adapted to legal-document analysis when the object of study is a record whose meaning changes over time.

In legal scholarship, document-based qualitative analysis is useful because legal meaning is often constructed through texts, entries, memoranda, orders, statutes, and later interpretations. Qualitative legal methods allow a researcher to examine how legal categories are produced, repeated, contested, and revised across documents (Mitchell, 2023). This is especially valuable where the legal problem is not simply what rule applies, but how a record came to be understood in a particular way.

Thematic analysis also supports this approach. Braun and Clarke (2022) emphasized that thematic analysis can be used to identify patterned meaning across data. In a legal-document study, themes may include plea scope, restorative completion, later predicate characterization, statutory change, and record integrity. These themes do not replace doctrinal analysis. They organize it.

Method

This article uses a qualitative narrative legal inquiry adapted to document-based analysis. The method is qualitative because the purpose is interpretive rather than statistical. The study does not measure variables, test causal hypotheses, or generalize from a sample population. It examines legal meaning, record sequence, classification, and later institutional interpretation.

The design is narrative because the legal dispute developed over time. Temporality is used to reconstruct the sequence from initial filing to plea-related proceeding, reparative-board sentence, successful completion, settlement, closure, later denials, and renewed record-relief arguments. Sociality is used to examine the roles of legal actors and institutions, including the court, prosecution, defense, and later record-relief decision makers. Spatiality is used to examine the legal settings in which the case changed meaning, including criminal procedure, reparative-board sentencing, and record-relief law.

The data sources consisted of documentary legal materials. These included the case docket and register materials, related memoranda, governing Vermont statutes, and legal authorities relevant to plea meaning, reparative sentencing, sealing, expungement, and predicate classification. The source base did not include interviews, surveys, or human-subject data. The study therefore did not require participant recruitment or informed consent.

The analysis proceeded in four stages. First, the documentary record was reviewed for chronology. This step separated contemporaneous events from later legal characterization. Second, the documents were coded for

legal function, including charge, plea-related entry, sentence, reparative-board referral, completion, settlement, closure, record-relief denial, and statutory classification. Third, the coded materials were mapped to narrative dimensions of temporality, sociality, and spatiality. Fourth, the analysis synthesized themes across the record.

Trustworthiness was addressed through source limitation, chronological reconstruction, cross-document comparison, and negative-case attention. Negative-case attention required the analysis to acknowledge the guilty-disposition language rather than ignore it. A credible article cannot claim that the record contains no guilty language if the record includes such language. The stronger scholarly claim is that the guilty language does not resolve every legal question.

Case Chronology

The case chronology is the foundation of the article's argument. The record begins with a Vermont misdemeanor charge under 13 V.S.A. § 3002. The defendant initially entered a not-guilty plea. The case later proceeded through a plea-related event, with a plea agreement filed and a reparative-board sentence imposed. The court then directed the matter into a Reparative Board process under 13 V.S.A. § 7030(a)(2). A later filing indicated successful completion of the reparative-board process. The scheduled status conference was then canceled because the case was settled, and the case was closed.

This chronology matters because it is not the chronology of an ordinary punitive disposition standing alone. It is the chronology of a mixed legal record. It contains punitive features, including guilty-disposition language. It also contains restorative features, including reparative-board referral, completion, settlement, and closure. Any later interpretation that recognizes only one side of that record is incomplete.

The February 11, 2014 entry must be read precisely. It is not properly treated as the date on which the defendant entered a new, freestanding plea to 13 V.S.A. § 3002. It is the date associated with successful completion of the reparative-board process. That distinction matters because completion of a reparative obligation is not the same legal act as admitting statutory elements in open court. If later records or interpretations treat February 11, 2014 as proof of an unqualified plea to the statute, that treatment creates a record-integrity problem.

The later record-relief history intensified the problem. Subsequent denials treated the conviction as a predicate offense because a first conviction under § 3002 could theoretically enhance punishment for a future conviction under the same statute. That reasoning attached future collateral meaning to the original disposition. Yet the predicate label did not appear as an express contemporaneous classification in the original plea or reparative-board entries. The label entered the legal story later.

Table 1

Condensed Case Chronology and Legal Meaning

Record Event	Analytic Meaning for Article
Misdemeanor filing under 13 V.S.A. § 3002	Original offense classification in the case record.
Initial not-guilty plea	The record begins as contested, not admitted.
Later plea-related proceeding and plea agreement filed	The formal resolution path begins and must be read through plea scope.
Sentencing to the Reparative Board	The disposition enters a restorative sentencing structure.
February 11, 2014 successful completion filing	Completion event, not a new plea to the statute.
Status conference canceled because the case was settled	The record reflects closure through settlement after completion.
Later record-relief denials	Predicate-style reinterpretation enters the legal story later.
Current statutory framework	Requires fresh analysis under present qualifying-crime and sealing law.

Note. The chronology preserves the distinction between an entry that completes the reparative process and an entry that would constitute a new plea. The February 11, 2014 record event is treated as completion, not as a new statutory admission.

Findings

Table 2

Article Findings and Scholarly Contribution

Finding	Record Problem	Scholarly Contribution
Mixed punitive-restorative sequence	The record contains both guilty-disposition language and restorative completion.	Avoids false binary between conviction and restoration.
February 11, 2014 as completion event	Later interpretation risks treating completion as new admission.	Clarifies record function by date and legal act.
Predicate-style compression	Later record-relief treatment narrows the full sequence into a punitive label.	Names record compression as a legal-scholarship problem.
Fresh statutory review	Older labels may not reflect current Chapter 230 text.	Requires current law rather than repeated shorthand.

Findings

Finding 1: The Record Preserved a Mixed Punitive-Restorative Sequence

The first finding is that the contemporaneous record preserved a mixed punitive-restorative sequence. The record cannot be described accurately as purely restorative because it contains formal criminal-procedure language, including guilty-disposition language. It also cannot be described accurately as purely punitive because it includes a plea-based Reparative Board sentence, successful completion of that process, settlement, and closure.

This mixed structure is legally significant. A reparative-board sentence is not decorative wording. It is a recognized sentencing mechanism that directs the case into a structured process of accountability and repair. When the person completes that process, the completion entry becomes part of the record's legal meaning. Later interpretation should not treat that completion as irrelevant simply because the record also includes conviction language.

The mixed structure also explains why the case is analytically important. If the record were purely punitive, later predicate-style treatment would be easier to defend. If the record were purely diversionary or non-adjudicative, erasure arguments would be easier to defend. But the record is neither. It occupies the harder middle: a formal criminal disposition embedded in a completed restorative process. That middle is where the legal question sits.

Finding 2: The February 11, 2014 Entry Was a Completion Event, Not a New Plea to the Statute

The second finding is that the February 11, 2014 entry should be interpreted as a reparative-completion event rather than as a new plea to 13 V.S.A. § 3002. That date belongs to the completion phase of the case. It does not, by itself, establish that the defendant newly admitted the statutory elements of the offense on that date. It does not replace the need to examine the earlier plea-related event, the plea agreement, and the actual disposition structure.

This finding is central because it addresses the record-integrity conflict directly. The record may contain guilty-disposition language, but that does not mean every later use of that language is truthful, complete, or legally accurate. A docket label can be true in one sense and incomplete in another. It can reflect a formal disposition while failing to capture the scope, conditions, sequence, and restorative meaning of the case.

For that reason, the article does not state the issue as a simplistic contradiction between guilt and innocence. The issue is record truth. The question is whether later legal actors treated the record as if the defendant entered an unqualified plea to the statute in a way that exceeds what the contemporaneous sequence proves. On that narrower point, the record supports a contested-record interpretation.

Finding 3: Later Predicate-Style Treatment Compressed the Record

The third finding is that later predicate-style treatment compressed the original record. The later record-relief analysis treated the offense through an enhancement-based rationale, reasoning that a first conviction under § 3002 could operate as a predicate for enhanced treatment if a later violation occurred. That analysis

shifted attention away from the original plea-based reparative structure and toward future punitive consequence.

This was not merely a change in vocabulary. It changed the legal meaning attached to the record. The defendant's completed reparative disposition was treated as a future-facing disqualifier. The case's restorative structure became secondary to its possible enhancement function. The result was record compression: a complex sequence became a simplified predicate label.

Record compression matters because legal labels travel. Once a court characterizes a record in a particular way, later proceedings may repeat that characterization without reexamining the underlying sequence. The label then becomes stronger than the record itself. That is precisely why courts should distinguish contemporaneous classification from later interpretive overlay.

Finding 4: Current Statutory Analysis Requires Fresh Classification Review

The fourth finding is that current statutory analysis requires fresh classification review. If the current Chapter 230 framework defines qualifying crimes differently from the framework used in earlier denials, then courts must analyze the offense under present statutory text. It is not enough to repeat earlier predicate-offense language if that language came from a prior statutory framework or from later judicial shorthand.

This finding does not presume the outcome of any future motion. A court may still decide that relief is unavailable for reasons grounded in current law. But the court should reach that conclusion through current statutory analysis, not through mechanical repetition of outdated reasoning. The legal question is whether the offense is excluded under current law, not whether an older denial used a label that later became habitual.

This distinction preserves the rule-of-law function of record relief. Sealing and expungement statutes are not symbolic. They define legal status, public access, and collateral consequences. If the statutory framework changes, then the analysis must change with it. Record-relief law cannot remain frozen in the interpretive vocabulary of an earlier statutory period.

Discussion

The findings support the article's central concept: record compression. Record compression occurs when later legal interpretation reduces a complex procedural record into a simplified label that overstates one aspect of the record and understates others. In this case, later predicate-style treatment emphasized future enhancement potential while under-weighting the reparative-board sentence, successful completion, settlement, and closure.

The concept does not require denying the formal criminal features of the record. That would be analytically weak. The record contains guilty-disposition language, and any serious manuscript must acknowledge it. But legal accuracy requires more than acknowledging the most punitive label. It requires reading that label in relation to the whole record. The fact that the record contains guilty language does not answer whether the February 11, 2014 entry was a plea event, whether the statute was expressly classified as a predicate offense at the original disposition, or whether current law still supports the same collateral classification.

The February 11, 2014 entry reveals why chronology matters. If that entry is treated as completion, then it supports the restorative sequence. If it is later treated as proof of a new statutory plea, then the record is being over-read. The difference is not semantic. It changes the legal story. Completion means the person satisfied the reparative process imposed by the court. A new plea means the person admitted guilt through a distinct legal act. Those are different events.

The article's contribution is strongest when it resists overstatement. The record does not support total erasure merely because reparative completion occurred. It also does not support total punitive compression merely because guilty-disposition language appears. The legally responsible interpretation is between those extremes: the case reflects a formal criminal disposition embedded in a completed restorative process, and later record-relief classification must account for both.

This middle position is important for restorative justice scholarship. Restorative justice often promises accountability, repair, and reintegration. But those promises are weakened when later legal systems treat completed restorative obligations as meaningless. If the record continues to operate only as punishment, then the restorative process becomes performative. It may have required accountability in practice while receiving no interpretive weight in later law.

Implications

Courts should read restorative-disposition records sequentially. A later court should identify the charge, the plea-related event, the plea agreement, the sentence, the reparative-board referral, completion, settlement, closure, and later record-relief history as distinct events. Only then can the court determine what the record actually proves.

Courts should also distinguish contemporaneous classification from later characterization. A label applied during record-relief proceedings may explain a prior ruling, but it does not necessarily establish what the original plea or disposition meant. That is especially true when the later label did not appear in the original docket entries.

Defense counsel should preserve the legal meaning of restorative dispositions at the time they are entered. If a plea-based reparative sentence is intended to have limited collateral meaning, that limitation should be placed clearly on the record. Counsel should also seek precise language regarding completion, settlement, closure, and later record-relief eligibility when possible.

Prosecutors should avoid treating restorative completion as meaningless in later proceedings. If the state participates in a disposition that directs a defendant into a reparative process and the defendant completes that process, later opposition to relief should account for that completion. The state may still oppose relief where law supports opposition, but it should not collapse the record into a punitive label that ignores the agreed or court-ordered reparative structure.

Restorative justice programs should document completion carefully. Later legal consequences may depend on whether the record clearly shows referral, participation, completion, and closure. A vague completion entry may be easier for later legal actors to minimize. A precise completion record can preserve the legal significance of the restorative process.

Limitations

This article is limited by its document-based design. The analysis depends on the available docket materials, memoranda, statutory text, and related legal authorities. It does not include a full plea-hearing transcript unless such transcript is part of the reviewed source record. Therefore, claims about the precise oral framing of the plea must remain tied to what the documentary record can support.

The article is also limited to one Vermont criminal case and one statutory offense. It does not claim that all reparative-board cases should be treated the same way. It does not establish a general rule that reparative completion eliminates conviction consequences. Instead, it offers a record-based analytic framework for identifying when later legal characterization may have exceeded the contemporaneous record.

A further limitation is that record-relief law is statutory and subject to change. Before journal submission or legal use, all statutory citations should be verified against the current Vermont Code and any relevant amendments. The scholarly argument remains stable, but the precise statutory analysis must remain current.

Recommendations for Future Research

Future research should examine whether record compression occurs in other restorative-disposition cases. A comparative study could analyze multiple dockets involving reparative-board sentencing, adult diversion, deferred sentences, sealing motions, and expungement petitions. Such research could determine whether later punitive shorthand commonly obscures restorative completion.

Future research should also examine how courts document reparative completion. If completion entries are inconsistent or vague, later record-relief courts may struggle to interpret them. A study of docket language could identify best practices for preserving the legal meaning of restorative processes.

Future scholarship should further examine the relationship between restorative justice and collateral consequences. Restorative justice theory often emphasizes reintegration, but criminal records frequently continue to impose exclusion. That contradiction deserves more direct attention. A person can complete a restorative process and still remain legally marked by a record system that fails to recognize completion as meaningful.

Conclusion

This article examined how a plea-based restorative disposition can be compressed into a later punitive label. The case record presented a mixed sequence: formal criminal-procedure language, plea-related activity, reparative-board sentencing, successful completion, settlement, closure, and later predicate-style treatment. The central legal problem was not whether one side of the record existed. The problem was whether later interpretation gave one side of the record controlling force while minimizing the other.

The February 11, 2014 entry is the clearest example. That entry belongs to the completion phase of the reparative process. It should not be treated as proof of a new, independent, or unqualified plea to 13 V.S.A. § 3002. To treat completion as admission is to distort the record. To treat the reparative sequence as meaningless is to compress the case into a punitive shorthand broader than the record itself supports.

The strongest interpretation is neither total erasure nor total punitive reduction. The record supports a more exact conclusion: the case involved a formal criminal disposition embedded in a completed restorative process, and later record-relief treatment must account for that full sequence. Courts, practitioners, and scholars should therefore read restorative-disposition records chronologically, textually, and under current law.

Restorative justice requires more than a program. It requires later legal interpretation that respects the program's place in the record. If courts allow completed restorative dispositions to be reduced to later punitive labels, then restorative justice loses part of its legal force. A record that contains restoration must not be read as though only punishment occurred.

References

Belcher, W. L. (2019). Writing your journal article in twelve weeks: A guide to academic publishing success (2nd ed.). University of Chicago Press.

Boykin v. Alabama, 395 U.S. 238 (1969).

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2022). Thematic analysis: A practical guide. SAGE.

Clandinin, D. J. (2013). Engaging in narrative inquiry. Routledge.

Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (2000). Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research. Jossey-Bass.

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2023). Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches (5th ed.). SAGE.

Gamache, J.-A. (2026). What was the plea? A qualitative narrative inquiry into a Vermont restorative justice disposition [Legal dissertation]. ResearchGate. https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.19582.34888

Karp, D. R. (2001). Harm and repair: Observing restorative justice in Vermont. Justice Quarterly, 18(4), 727-757.

Karp, D. R., & Drakulich, K. M. (2006). Minor crime in a quaint setting: Practices, outcomes, and limits of Vermont reparative probation boards. Criminology & Public Policy, 5(4), 655-686.

McCarthy v. United States, 394 U.S. 459 (1969).

Mitchell, M. (2023). Analyzing the law qualitatively. Qualitative Research Journal, 23(1), 102-114.

Prescott, J. J., & Starr, S. B. (2020). Expungement of criminal convictions: An empirical study. Harvard Law Review, 133(8), 2460-2555.

State v. Cleary, 2003 VT 9.

State v. Yates, 169 Vt. 20 (1999).

Vermont Statutes Annotated, 3 V.S.A. § 164.

Vermont Statutes Annotated, 13 V.S.A. § 3002.

Vermont Statutes Annotated, 13 V.S.A. § 6565.

Vermont Statutes Annotated, 13 V.S.A. § 7030.

Vermont Statutes Annotated, 13 V.S.A. §§ 7601-7607.

Zehr, H. (2015). The little book of restorative justice: Revised and updated. Good Books.